DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 104 CS 002 406

AUTHOR Schnell, Thomas R.; Burnett, Richard W.
TITLE A Competency-Based Approach to Preparing Secondary Level Teachers of Reading: (1) Substance and Content, (2) Philosophy and Rationale.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 23p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the Communications/Reading Conference (1st, Nashville, Tennessee, June 16-20, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Content Reading; Higher Education; *Performance Based Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Reading Comprehension; Reading Consultants; *Reading Instruction; Reading Programs; *Reading Skills; *Secondary Grades; Study Skills; Teacher Education; Vocabulary

ABSTRACT

These two papers were presented at a two-part session on using a competency-based approach to secondary reading teacher preparation. The philosophy and rationale of a performance based approach to reading are discussed by Richard W. Burnett. Competency-based courses in secondary reading are contrasted with such courses in elementary reading and realistic constraints are noted. Thomas R. Schrell identifies essential knowledge areas and teaching skills related to reading for the secondary school classroom teacher and the potential secondary school reading specialist and describes the topics covered in a "Reading in the Secondary Schools" methods course for preparing such teachers. The topics of the units of the course are as follows: course orientation and history of reading instruction; group standardized measurement and evaluation; expectancy and readability; informal reading tests; vocabulary development and word recognition; literal comprehension skills; higher level comprehension skills; study skills; reading in content areas; instructional materials; and organization and management of reading programs. The course format of lecture-reading, performance, and field experience is explained in detail. (MKM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED119104

Thomas R. Schnell
University of Missouri-St. Louis
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas R. Schnell

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

"A Competency-Based Approach: Substance and Content"

Session: A Competency-Based Approach to Preparing Secondary Level Teachers of Reading
Thursday, May 2, 1974
3:45 - 4:45 p.m.

CS002406

To the editor: It should be noted that this paper is one of a two-paper session which develops the philosophy and rationale of our program at UMSL, as well as describes the course content. For complete understanding, the papers should be considered together.

In developing a "competency-based" course for preparing people to teach reading in secondary school situations, we found ourselves faced with several problems which would be common for anyone attempting such a course. For example, with a semester that has somehow shrunk to only 14 weeks, a limited number of units (or modules) had to be selected. Certainly there are many areas that could have been included in the course had more time been available; however, we had to choose those which seemed to be most important to the students as future practitioners in the classroom. These judgments were based on three criteria: 1) The relative value of a given ability or knowledge based on the judgment of the course instructors (who have a total of 20 years teaching experience in junior/senior high schools and college level reading improvement classes; 2) the relative value of a given ability or knowledge based on the judgment of currently-practicing secondary school teachers; and 3) the types of treatment given the various topics in existing textbooks on reading in secondary schools.

Another problem was that of the dichotomy which exists between the students. Some of them intend to be content teachers who look at reading instruction as an adjunct to their "real" job, while others are preparing to be reading specialists and are pursuing graduate study in reading.

Yet another was the problem of teaching the students the content of the reading course as well as teaching them how to teach that same content.

Finally, and perhaps the most difficult problem of all, was determining how we would measure "competency." Certainly the ultimate test of such pupil gain is performance, but in a class such as ours we had to settle for a compromise for we could not observe actual teaching done by the students in the course. At any rate, we recognize the limitations in what we have done; on the other hand, we feel that the course has been very successful and have gathered data which indicate that the students have gained in knowledge and ability, and have developed very positive feelings about the course.

Course Structure

The usual sequence of events as they now exist in the program follows this pattern: the class meets twice a week for 75 minutes each time. On the first meeting of the week, the students hear a lecture over one of the unit topics (over which they have already been assigned readings), followed by a question-answer period to clarify any problems related to either the assigned readings or the lecture. At the close of the period, a "competency" activity is distributed to the class for completion before the next class session.

At the second meeting of the week, the "competency" activities are collected and discussed so that any remaining difficulties may be clarified. The unit is then concluded with a "Knowledge Quiz," which is a 15 point quiz made up of true-false and/or short answer questions. Scoring is Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory on the activities -- the quiz is scored in the normal fashion. It is important to note that this sequence is crucial. If the goal is a mastery level of knowledge of subject, as well as a proven ability to utilize that knowledge effec-

tively, this order of events is more likely to provide the desired results than any other. The course concludes with a final examination which is equally balanced between items which measure knowledge and those which measure application of knowledge.

A supplement to the course at this time is a volunteer tutoring experience in a secondary school (junior high through college). It is our belief that this part of the course is vital; therefore, in the future a required laboratory/tutoring experience will be added and developed as a further "competency" measure.

Course Content

As mentioned previously, the number of units in the course was determined somewhat by the number of weeks in the semester, which at our university is 14. We felt that by developing 12 units, we would be able to devote more than one lecture period to those we felt were more crucial, have some time for an orientation, and perhaps have a total review before the final exam. The titles of the units are as follows:

1. Course Orientation; History of Reading Instruction
2. Group Standardized Measurement and Evaluation
3. Expectancy and Readability
4. Informal Reading Tests
5. Vocabulary Development and Word Recognition
6. Literal Comprehension Skills
7. Higher Level Comprehension Skills
8. Study Skills
9. Reading in Content Areas

10. Reading in Content Areas

11. Instructional Materials

12. Organization and Management of Reading Programs

This order seemed logical to us, particularly after the first time the course was offered. At that time, "Reading in Content Areas" preceded "Study Skills," but reversing the order in the second semester helped clarify some confusion which existed the first time.

Unit Content

At this point, each unit will be described in terms of the major ideas covered in the lectures, the ideas covered in the quizzes, and the "competencies" that students demonstrated. No attempt will be made to list all the objectives of the units; however, the unit on standardized measurement will be covered in more depth later so that the objectives can be examined.

The first unit, "History of Reading Instruction," is the only one for which there is no quiz or related competency. The purpose is simply to place the importance of reading (literacy) in the proper perspective, while covering topics such as how reading has been taught in this country from about the 17th century to the present time, some of the arguments about how reading should be taught (phonics vs. whole words for example), the "classic" approach to reading instruction, and concluding with a look at reading in the secondary schools. This sets the tone for our pragmatic, non-theoretical approach to the content of the rest of the course.

For now, the unit on standardized measurement will be omitted. Unit 3 deals with the topics of reading expectancy and readability of

materials. The discussion of expectancy is limited to the theory underlying the formulas; i.e., the informed estimate of potential to learn to read based on verbal and non-verbal intelligence scores, age, and amount of schooling, and 3 of the widely-used expectancy formulas (Mental Age, Harris, and Bond and Tinker). The weaknesses and strengths of using each or any of these measures are discussed, and examples of their calculations are given. The "competency" activity calls for the students in the course to calculate some expectancies from data given, then to interpret the findings. Readability is also discussed in terms of formulas, the Fry and the SMOG. The major limitation of arbitrary grade level designations that have no real meaning in terms of established performance criteria is explained. Sources of materials with pre-established readability are provided. The activity calls for the calculation of readability of an article using one of the formulas mentioned above. The quiz calls for knowledge of the expectancy and readability strengths, weaknesses, and possible used.

Unit 4 covers informal reading tests, particularly the IRI technique and cloze testing. The main points are the construction, administration, and interpretation of the tests, and the process of error analysis for planning instruction. The activity centers around an audio tape of a young man's reading. Students listen to the tape, do oral error recording, assess independent, instructional, and frustrational levels, and do an error analysis of miscue patterns. The quiz is mainly concerned with identification of IRI components and the procedure for administration and scoring. These units constitute the first segment of the course; that is, the steps of preparing for instruction.

The "middle" part of the course deals with instructional strategies. Unit 5 is on word recognition skills, and covers the major skills of sight vocabulary, phonic analysis, structural analysis, context, and dictionary use. The lecture highlights the reasons why school teachers need to know about teaching word recognition skills, what those skills are, the types of problems they are most likely to encounter in the classroom, and a brief example of how to teach each of the skills. The activity has several components, the two most important of which are the identification of the most likely skill weakness from a list of common errors and the steps (with examples) of teaching a phonic element such as the "ch" consonant digraph. The quiz concentrates mostly on the role of the secondary school teacher in identifying and correcting word recognition problems.

Units 6 and 7 are companion units dealing with literal comprehension and higher level comprehension skills respectively. At the literal level, efforts are made to break comprehension into teachable units -- words, sentences, paragraphs, and lengthier units -- and examples are given for teaching them. Particular emphasis is given to the "About-Point" activity where the reader reads paragraphs at an appropriate level of difficulty, then writes what the paragraph is <u>about</u> in a word or short phrase. The <u>point</u> activity then calls for the use of the <u>about</u> word as the subject of a sentence which restates or summarizes the paragraph. The "competency" activity calls for students to write their own passages and to develop them into an "About-Point" exercise.

The higher level comprehension skills unit concentrates on interpretation and critical reading. Some approaches to teaching each are

described; the activity requires both the identification of the type of skill needed to handle a given passage, and the development of a strategy for teaching that passage to a high school class. The quizzes for both units are mainly concerned with "how to do" information.

The unit on study skills covers general areas like listening and note taking, outlining, and SQ3R. The activity requires the student to apply SQ3R to a previously-read chapter of the textbook, then subjectively contrast the results of the SQ3R application to those of the earlier reading. The quiz deals mainly with knowledge of effective methods of using and teaching planned study techniques.

Reading in content areas deals with 3 approaches to the implementation of reading skills in teaching various content materials. Described are the Directed Reading Activity, the "Levels of Comprehension" approach attributed to Harold Herber in Teaching Reading in Content Areas, and an unnamed approach which features pre-testing, study reading, and prescriptive teaching. The activity calls for the student to read a passage from world events, determine which approach seems to fit it best, and develop an outline for teaching the passage.

Unit 10 concludes the middle section of the course, that of instructional strategies, and deals with reading rate. A number of misunderstandings are discussed (i.e., 25,000 wpm rates), approaches to helping readers improve their rates are suggested, especially book-oriented alternatives, and materials are described. The activity requires reading of a passage, calculation of rate, and the writing of 10 comprehension questions over the passage which might give a valid appraisal of comprehension. The quiz deals mainly with practical uses of the theory relating to rate of reading.

The final segment of the course is intended to help in several areas related to reading, but not just in the instructional process. Units 11 and 12 deal with selection and utilization of instructional materials and the organizing and managing of school reading programs. The "materials" unit describes 3 areas: boxed laboratories, workbooks, and machines and films. Examples of each type are given, along with an analysis of each's strengths and weaknesses. The major thesis is that these should be used as models for teacher-made materials. The activity calls for preparing a budget to equip a reading center, given $2500 to do it. Each item listed requires a brief justification. The final unit describes a program that has developmental, corrective, and remedial components, the steps in establishing such a program, and the roles of the reading teacher working in that program. The activity calls for development of a set of questionnaires for surveying faculty and public knowledge and feelings about the reading program, or an outline for developing an in-service program in the school.

That, in general, is the course as it is now being taught. At this time, let's look specifically at Unit 2. In this unit, the students are first assigned reading from Karlin's book, Teaching Reading in High School (2nd edition), which gives them a background and mental set for a discussion of group administered standardized reading achievement tests. The specific assignment is pp. 77-94, covering the values of such tests, norms, selection of tests, possible uses of the tests, and their limitations. The lecture then states more specifically the major values of these tests -- measuring growth over an extended time period, subtest profiling for group and individual diagnosing, item analysis, and oral application for more extensive diagnosis of individuals.

Other points covered in the lecture are the appearance of growth or regression due to artificial test "floors" and "ceilings," the need to use percentile scores in conjunction with grade scores in judging validity of results, and the influence of the "guess factor" in inflating scores.

Some further suggestions for test use include the desirability of first-hand teacher knowledge of the test used, and involving students in analysis of the results.

This unit has several behavioral and learning objectives, including:

The student will

1. become ego-involved in taking a standardized reading test appropriate to his reading level, and will acquire a greater appreciation for possible pupil reactions to such an experience.
2. experience the arbitrary manner in which reading achievement is operationally defined and measured via standardized tests.
3. obtain a feeling for the impact of directions for administering and the timing of subtests on individual performances.
4. observe how chance responses to items may influence scores.
5. read and follow directions for scoring a test, using norm tables, interpreting raw scores, percentiles and grade equivalent scores, and drawing inferences from test results regarding reading strengths and weaknesses.
6. extrapolate learnings from this experience to the selection, administration, and interpretation of other standardized reading tests in other situations.

The "competency" activity has 2 parts. First, the students take a reading achievement test (the Burnett Reading Series Survey Test, Senior Level, Form A) in a group testing situation. During the following laboratory activity, each student takes his own answer sheet and scores it with an answer key. He records the percentile score for each subtest, and the total score percentile and grade equivalent. He then reads excerpts from the manual describing the test and providing patterns for interpretation of results. He then writes a brief analysis of his own test performance, interpreting it based on reading the course text and the test manual, and on material covered in the lecture. He also writes his own subjective feelings and reactions to the experience.

Evaluation is "Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory," based on the criteria of accuracy in scoring, using the norms, recognizing possible subtest differences, and the interpretation of results. Subjective student comments are noted for further discussion.

The quiz of unit knowledge is a 15 item true-false test which has been item-analyzed and revised twice. It now appears to be a valid and reliable quiz. At any rate, this is the current form of our attempt at producing a "Competency-Based Approach to Preparing Secondary Level Teachers of Reading."

References

Burnett, Richard. Burnett Reading Series Survey Test, Senior Level, Form A. Scholastic Test Service, Bensenville, Illinois, 1966.

Herber, Harold. Teaching Reading in Content Areas. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1971.

Karlin, Robert. Teaching Reading in High School, 2nd Edition, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1972.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Richard W. Burnett
University of Missouri-St. Louis
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard W. Burnett

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

"A Competency-Based Approach: Philosophy and Rationale"

Session: A Competency-Based Approach to Preparing Secondary Level Teachers of Reading
Thursday, May 2, 1974
3:45 - 4:45 p.m.

CS 002 406

To the editor: It should be noted that this paper is one of a two-paper session which develops the philosophy and rationale of our program at UMSL, as well as describes the course content. For complete understanding, the papers should be considered together.

Like it or not, in teacher education we are clearly in the era of behaviorally-stated learning objectives, competency-based programs and the modular construction of courses. What may not be so clear is just what all this jargon means in terms of preparing better teachers of reading. Surely, no teacher educator in the entire history of teacher education would admit that any part of what he asked his students to do did not result in their being more competent teachers. At least he thought so when he had them doing it. This presentation will be one attempt to cut through the jargon, briefly analyze a few of the past and current features of the competency-based instructional movement and state some implications for the continuing effort to educate better teachers of reading, expecially at the secondary level.

An Old Competency Model with Implications for the New

True competency-based teacher education (CBTE) or PBTE is not as new a concept as some seem to feel. The now traditional practice of building practicum courses into programs, usually at graduate level, which require laboratory or clinical work in reading diagnosis and in remedial teaching of disabled readers is a legitimate competency-based strategy. Ordinarily in these programs there has been one or more courses preceding the practicum work. Reading educators who supervise the practicum courses have always been sensitive to the extent to which prior preparation in lecture-discussion or "theory" courses, affects teacher performance in actual work with children. Even in this rather closed system of training remedial reading teachers, however, the

university level instructor is kept aware of the less than perfect correspondence between the way teachers indicate they would approach a problem as posed to them in a theory course and the actual way they function in a practicum situation. Maximizing this correspondence through the early use of demonstrations, case studies, and simulated teaching activities has become a trademark of reading methods classes. It does not appear to be out of step with the times to suggest that a reasonable definition of competency-based teacher education is that it is the effort to maximize the correspondence between what teachers are taught to do and what they actually do in an on-the-job setting. Implicit is such a definition, of course, in that the validity (in terms of effective pupil learning) has been established for what the teachers are being taught to do.

Two essential features of any genuine competency-based strategy have been built into the better clinical reading programs throughout the country. First of all, the validity of the whole structure rests on whether children taught in the remedial practicum at the end of the sequence of courses emerged as significantly better readers or not. For that reason, changes in pupil achievement have been assessed as one part of the practicum experience. Secondly, a feedback principle has operated, whereby a practicum supervisor could modify the presentation in beginning theory courses in accordance with what graduate students were observed to be doing in the practicum courses at the end of the sequence. Strategies which do not attempt to build in a validity factor and a feedback cycle should be viewed with skepticism when loud claims are made that they are competency-based approaches to teacher education. It seems likely that few of the new CBTE models can meet

such a test.

Current Direction in CBTE

A basic contrast between the older clinical reading model and the newer CBTE approaches is in the attempt to define, develop and measure competencies in individuals on a much broader scale and often without benefit of specific clinical experiences. In addition, the current emphasis in CBTE is in the undergraduate or pre-service education of teachers. There are few teachers today who have progressed through the sequence of a methods course in developmental reading, a methods course in remedial or corrective teaching, a practicum in diagnostic testing and a practicum in remedial teaching. It is probable that for some time the majority of teachers will stop with one rather general course in reading instruction. For that reason, the introductory "theory" courses have to be presented so that the liklihood is maximized that teachers will perform later on the job in accordance with the concepts presented in the one class.

Naturally, there are a number of problems inherent in building genuine competency activities into undergraduate courses. Often there are likely to be larger enrollments in undergraduate classes than in graduate classes. Students are without the "need-to-know" attitude held by graduate or in-service teachers who can relate each new learning directly to their job experience. Undergraduate programs of courses tend to be crowded with both general and professional education requirements that place limits on the number of course hours that can be devoted to work in a specific aspect of the curriculum such as reading instruction.

Since competency or job relevance is demanded early and in large

classes where supervised practicum work ordinarily is not feasible, an emerging emphasis is on paper-and-pencil learning exercises (competency activities) which are sometimes keyed into audio-visual presentations. These simulation experiences calling for responses approximating as closely as possible those responses called for in an actual classroom setting are tending to take up course time previously given over to lecture-discussion and assigned text and library reading. Such activities can change a class from an abstract, academic exercises to an involving learning experience where direct application is made of newly presented concepts. Probably the greatest single danger in this trend would be the assumption that realistic-appearing paper-and-pencil exercises with impressive sounding learning objectives behind them are superior in all cases to other approaches to instruction. The GBTE movement can collapse quickly if the means or instruments of education become confused with the ends or purposes of the education effort. The message here for reading educators is two-fold. First, effective teaching devices developed through the years must not be too readily discarded simply because their mode of presentation is not consistent with the latest fad or fashion. Conversely, many of the older lecture-discussion presentations may be readily adaptable to the newer programmed paper-and-pencil task modules and, in fact, such adaptations may provide for much more efficient utilization of time and more effective learning.

Finally, something needs to be said about the controversial issue of who should make the decision regarding change in instructional approach. Right up until the present time, the decision has tended to be that of the university instructor to make. Historically, accountability in long-range competency terms has had to rest on the credibility

and integrity of the professors who were educating the teachers. Professors have been judged by the performance of their students, by their research and published commentary and by their involvement in solving educational problems. When instructional modes are mandated from external sources, whether these be state legislatures, deans of education, departmental chairmen or faculty curriculum committees, it should be clearly understood that a system judgment is being superimposed on the judgment of the individual instructor. Consequently, responsibility for relevance or for establishing the ultimate validity of the competencies developed in teacher education programs shifts from an individual instructor's shoulders to those who are mandating change. For those disenchanted with university professors and their alleged resistance to change and fascination with teaching irrelevancies, it should be kept in mind that it may be more feasible for individual professors to remain current and relevant in what they teach in a fast-changing world than for group-planned systems, that have taken months or even years to construct, to be kept current and relevant. To take the present independence of university instructors in curricular matters away from them and substitute bureaucratic or committee-based decision-making just might be a big step backward from competency-based teacher education. CBTE, rationally implemented, promises a new vigor for teacher education and a definite move toward the improvement of instruction in our schools. As simply another oversold, or overbought, curricular fad, it can be counterproductive.

Competency-Based Courses in Secondary Reading Contrasted With Elementary Reading

It should not be surprising that competency-based programs for

preparing teachers to teach reading in elementary grades have developed earlier and exist in greater variety than comparable programs for preparing secondary teachers. The instructor who prepares pre-service or in-service elementary teachers in reading instructional methods assumes that all his students accept the responsibility to teach reading as basic and will, in fact, be engaged in teaching children to read in a short time, if not already doing so. The instructor of pre-service or in-service secondary teachers faces a more complex situation. First of all, the majority of his class are not likely to perceive that they are or ever will be reading teachers. At most, they see that their responsibility towards teaching reading is only peripheral to their basic responsibility, which is to teach their discipline or content field. In preparing teachers it is easier to address the issue of how to teach reading directly than it is to prepare teachers to teach reading indirectly as it relates to content area instruction. Among other problems, the secondary teacher has to be equipped to meet several classes each day composed of different groups of students. It is likely that the secondary teacher will have less time for individual analysis of pupil needs, fewer resources to draw on for differentiating instruction, and less contact with pupils than an elementary teacher is likely to have.

A second group found in a reading methods course is, or aspires to be, special reading teachers, and they do have a commitment to teaching reading as their primary responsibility. In contrast to elementary teachers, however, the secondary reading teachers are taught that their professional obligations include more than the direct teaching of pupils.

Special reading teachers in order to have a significant impact in a secondary school setting must be an influence on other teachers and must accept that they have in-service training functions that are part and parcel of their efforts to improve pupils' reading proficiency and habits. In effect, these special teachers have to be masters enough of their craft that they can teach others to teach reading, some of whom are quite reluctant to admit that teaching reading is in any way part of their responsibility.

A further complication in secondary level reading courses is that the student teachers may lack or be weak in the very skills they are expected to learn how to teach. This possibility exists in elementary methods courses also, but it looms as a greater problem in secondary courses, since many high school teachers are not appreciably better readers than the higher achievers among their pupils.

In summary, then, the secondary teacher not only must possess word recognition, vocabulary and literal comprehension skills but also interpretive reading, critical reading, and study-type reading skills of a very high order. He is required, further, to be able to develop these skills in others. In a secondary methods course, the teacher educator has an extremely complex set of competencies to consider, including (1) the prospective teacher must possess and demonstrate the skills he is meant to teach, (2) he must demonstrate that he is knowledgeable about how to teach these skills, and (3) he must demonstrate that he has some insight into how to lead other teachers into the effective teaching of basic reading skills.

Realistic Constraints in Preparing Competency-Based Courses in Secondary Reading

A reading methods course is only one component in the total teacher

education program in a given university setting. Consequently, those competencies stressed, time scheduling factors, and the planned learning activities in a single course must be compatible with the broader scope program. Ultimately, any given course, once it is clearly conceptualized, may be divided into components or modules and integrated into a total program along with other courses. When this happens, it then becomes theoretically possible for students to "test out" of certain learning modules and for them to proceed in patterns and at a pace differing from other students. Teacher educators are being told that the technology exists now for the implementation of such programs. Indeed, the "hardware" potential probably does exist but the "software" aspects, i.e. the defined and validated competency activities, still need considerable development. Also the proper balance between lecture-discussion, group interaction, simulation activities, assigned reading and field experience remains a matter of sheer speculation and is open to considerable difference of opinion.

The hard realities of a university's traditions and operating procedures must be faced in planning any move toward implementing competency-based practices in a secondary reading methods class. For example, in an urban university it is not unusual for parallel programs to be offered daytime and in the evening division. In such a setting, students are often commuters and have job responsibilities that make the scheduling of laboratory components to a course difficult to arrange. More often than not, university instructors who seek to prepare a course's content and present it in competency units are confined to specified hour limits. Courses may be offered in three hour segments with daytime

classes meeting for fifty minute periods three days per week, while evening classes may tend to meet two evenings per week for an hour and a quarter or one evening for two and one-half hours for the same course credit. Several different instructors may be teaching the same course, if not at one time, at least over the span of two or three semesters. Some instructors may be public school reading specialists who are only teaching part-time for the university. Why is it necessary to mention these factors? To be realistic at the present time a competency-based strategy must be uncomplicated enough that it reasonably can be adapted and implemented in such a setting as that just described.

Concluding Statement

In the January 1974 Phi Delta Kappan, an entire issue devoted to CBTE, Rosner and Kay make the following observation:

> Competency-based teacher education is not an end in itself. It is a process of moving from the present ambiguous state of teacher education to a more clearly articulated program of professional education. CBTE is a transitional model for establishing teacher education of a firm theoretical and empirical base ultimately directed to the improved delivery of educational services.

In preparing to develop, describe or defend any CBTE effort, it may help the educator's perspective if the terms "process of moving" and "transitional model" as used by Rosner and Kay are kept in mind. In that dynamic rather than static context, any current effort should be characterized by several features. First, the knowledge and competencies programmed into a course should be based on the best validity criteria available at the time, such validity grounded on the measured performance of pupils in schools, wherever possible. Secondly, deliberate steps must be taken to verify that the products of the

course ably perform the functions on the job that the course was intended to prepare them to perform. Third, provision should be built in for modifying the course in response to feedback received as a result of follow-up on the earlier products. Fourth, plans should be flexible enough that the course can be adjusted to meet the varying interests and needs of different groups without sacrificing the basic competency features. Here the reference is to differences in background, ability, and interests of the students. Fifth, the course plan should be adaptable enough that it can be implemented in time segments that may vary from one section of the course to another and can be taught by instructors who might not have been involved in its original development.

The next part of this dually presented set of papers concerns itself with the specifics of one course in reading methods for secondary teachers. In initiating the course the attempt was to develop practices which as much as possible met the characteristics outlined in this first paper. After a year's experience with the program and in spite of all the rhetoric in this rationale, there are two rather mundane-sounding cautions that are worth passing on to others ready to embark on such a venture. First of all, resist a tendency to develop activities just for activity's sake when attempting to come up with competency activities or simulated teaching exercises. Secondly, once the components are developed, resist a natural tendency to cut back drastically in preparation time, under the assumption that the job of preparation was done so well last time around that this semester the program will go on under its own steam. It won't.

Reference:

Rosner, Benjamin and Kay, Patricia M. "Will the Promise of C/PBTE Be Fulfilled?" Phi Delta Kappan Vol. LV, No. 5 (January 1974), 295.